

LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.

Todd M. Friedman, Esq. (SBN: 216752)
tfriedman@attorneysforconsumers.com
Nicholas J. Bontrager, Esq. (SBN: 252114)
nbontrager@attorneysforconsumers.com
369 S. Doheny Dr., #415
Beverly Hills, CA 90211
Telephone: (877) 206-4741
Facsimile: (866) 633-0228

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC

Abbas Kazerounian, Esq. (SBN: 249203)
ak@kazlg.com
Matthew M. Loker, Esq. (SBN 279939)
ml@kazlg.com
245 Fischer Avenue, Unit D1
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
Telephone: (800) 400-6808
Facsimile: (800) 520-5523

HYDE & SWIGART

Joshua B. Swigart, Esq. (SBN: 225557)
josh@westcoastlitigation.com
411 Camino Del Rio South, Suite 301
San Diego, CA 92108
Telephone: (619) 233-7770
Facsimile: (619) 297-1022

Attorneys for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**CASEY BLOTZER,
INDIVIDUALLY AND ON
BEHALF OF ALL OTHERS
SIMILARLY SITUATED,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**NORTHSTAR LOCATION
SERVICES, LLC,**

Defendant.

Case No.: '13CV2213 L BGS

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR
DAMAGES**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

1 1. CASEY BLOTZER (“Plaintiff”) brings this Class Action Complaint
2 for damages, injunctive relief, and any other available legal or equitable remedies,
3 resulting from the illegal actions of NORTHSTAR LOCATION SERVICES,
4 LLC (“Defendant”), in negligently and/or willfully contacting Plaintiff on
5 Plaintiff’s cellular telephone, in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection
6 Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., (“TCPA”), thereby invading Plaintiff’s privacy.
7 Plaintiff alleges as follows upon personal knowledge as to herself and her own
8 acts and experiences, and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief,
9 including investigation conducted by his attorneys.
10

11 2. The TCPA was designed to prevent calls and text messages like the
12 ones described herein, and to protect the privacy of citizens like Plaintiff.
13 “Voluminous consumer complaints about abuses of telephone technology – for
14 example, computerized calls dispatched to private homes – prompted Congress to
15 pass the TCPA.” *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740, 744 (2012).

16 3. In enacting the TCPA, Congress intended to give consumers a choice
17 as to how corporate entities may contact them, and made specific findings that
18 “[t]echnologies that might allow consumers to avoid receiving such calls are not
19 universally available, are costly, are unlikely to be enforced, or place an
20 inordinate burden on the consumer. TCPA, Pub.L. No. 102–243, § 11. In
21 support of this, Congress found that

22 [b]anning such automated or prerecorded telephone
23 calls to the home, except when the receiving party
24 consents to receiving the call or when such calls are
25 necessary in an emergency situation affecting the health
26 and safety of the consumer, is the only effective means
27 of protecting telephone consumers from this nuisance
28 and privacy invasion.

1 Id. at § 12; see also *Martin v. Leading Edge Recovery Solutions, LLC*, 2012 WL
2 3292838, at* 4 (N.D.Ill. Aug. 10, 2012) (citing Congressional findings on
3 TCPA's purpose).

4
5 4. Congress also specifically found that “the evidence presented to the
6 Congress indicates that automated or prerecorded calls are a nuisance and an
7 invasion of privacy, regardless of the type of call...” Id. at §§ 12-13. See also,
8 *Mims*, 132 S. Ct. at 744.

9
10 5. As Judge Easterbrook of the Seventh Circuit recently explained in a
11 TCPA case regarding calls to a non-debtor similar to this one:

12
13 The Telephone Consumer Protection Act ... is well
14 known for its provisions limiting junk-fax
15 transmissions. A less-litigated part of the Act curtails
16 the use of automated dialers and prerecorded messages
17 to cell phones, whose subscribers often are billed by the
18 minute as soon as the call is answered—and routing a
19 call to voicemail counts as answering the call. An
20 automated call to a landline phone can be an
21 annoyance; an automated call to a cell phone adds
22 expense to annoyance.

23
24 *Soppet v. Enhanced Recovery Co., LLC*, 679 F.3d 637, 638 (7th Cir. 2012).

25 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

26 6. This Court has federal question jurisdiction because this case arises
27 out of violations of federal law. 47 U.S.C. §227(b); *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs.,*
28 *LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740 (2012).

7. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Southern
District of California pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and 1441(a) because

1 Defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, State of
2 California.

3 **PARTIES**

4 8. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a citizen and
5 resident of the State of California. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein
6 was, a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (10).

7 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that
8 Defendant is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a Limited Liability Company
9 whose State of Incorporation and principal place of business is in the State of
10 New York. Defendant, is and at all times mentioned herein was, a limited
11 partnership and is a “person,” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (10). Plaintiff
12 alleges that at all times relevant herein Defendant conducted business in the State
13 of California and in the County of San Diego, and within this judicial district.
14

15 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

16 10. At all times relevant, Plaintiff was a citizen of the State of California.
17 Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a “person” as defined by 47
18 U.S.C. § 153 (10).

19 11. Defendant is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a limited
20 liability company and a “person,” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (10).

21 12. At all times relevant Defendant conducted business in the State of
22 California and in the County of San Diego, within this judicial district.

23 13. Beginning sometime on or around July of 2013, Defendant began to
24 utilize Plaintiff’s cellular telephone number, ending in 3426, in an attempt to
25 collect an alleged debt that is not owed by Plaintiff, but in fact allegedly owed by
26 someone else.

27 14. On at least one (1) occasion, that being on July 15, 2013 at
28 approximately 5:33pm PST, Defendant placed a telephone call to Plaintiff’s

1 cellular telephone seeking to collect the alleged debt owed by someone other than
2 Plaintiff.

3 15. The calls Defendant placed to Plaintiff's cellular telephone were
4 placed via an "automatic telephone dialing system," ("ATDS") as defined by 47
5 U.S.C. § 227 (a)(1) as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).

6 16. This ATDS has the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers
7 to be dialed, using a random or sequential number generator.

8 17. When Plaintiff did not answer Defendant's telephone call, Defendant
9 left a voice message on Plaintiff's cellular telephone.

10 18. Defendant's July 15, 2013 voice message left on Plaintiff's cellular
11 telephone utilized an "artificial or prerecorded voice" as prohibited by 47 U.S.C.
12 § 227(b)(1)(A)

13 19. The telephone number that Defendant, or its agents, called was
14 assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for
15 incoming calls pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1).

16 20. These telephone calls constituted calls that were not for emergency
17 purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A)(i).

18 21. As Plaintiff does not owe the alleged debt owed, does not owe any
19 debts to Defendant and never provided Defendant with her cellular telephone
20 number, Defendant's calls were placed without Plaintiff's prior express consent
21 pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).

22 22. These telephone calls by Defendant, or its agents, violated 47 U.S.C.
23 § 227(b)(1).

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

23. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of herself and on behalf of and all others similarly situated (“the Class”).

24. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, the Class, consisting of All persons within the United States who received any telephone call/s from Defendant or its agent/s and/or employee/s to said person’s cellular telephone made through the use of any automatic telephone dialing system and/or an artificial or pre-recorded voice and such person had not previously consented to receiving such calls within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint.

25. Defendant and its employees or agents are excluded from the Class. Plaintiff does not know the number of members in the Class, but believes the Class members number in the thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter should be certified as a Class action to assist in the expeditious litigation of this matter.

26. Plaintiff and members of the Class were harmed by the acts of Defendant in at least the following ways: Defendant, either directly or through its agents, illegally contacted Plaintiff and the Class members via their cellular telephones, thereby causing Plaintiff and the Class members to incur certain cellular telephone charges or reduce cellular telephone time for which Plaintiff and the Class members previously paid, and invading the privacy of said Plaintiff and the Class members. Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged thereby.

27. This suit seeks only damages and injunctive relief for recovery of economic injury on behalf of the Class, and it expressly is not intended to request any recovery for personal injury and claims related thereto. Plaintiff reserves the right to expand the Class definition to seek recovery on behalf of additional persons as warranted as facts are learned in further investigation and discovery.

28. The joinder of the Class members is impractical and the disposition of their claims in the Class action will provide substantial benefits both to the

1 parties and to the court. The Class can be identified through Defendant's records
2 or Defendant's agents' records.

3 29. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law
4 and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented. The questions of law
5 and fact to the Class predominate over questions which may affect individual
6 Class members, including the following:

- 7 a) Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint,
8 Defendant or its agents placed any calls to the Class (other than a
9 call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express
10 consent of the called party) to a Class member using any automatic
11 dialing system and/or an artificial or prerecorded voice to any
12 telephone number assigned to a cellular phone service;
13
14 b) Whether Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged thereby, and
15 the extent of damages for such violation; and
16
17 c) Whether Defendant and its agents should be enjoined from engaging
18 in such conduct in the future.

19 30. As a person that received calls from Defendant via an automated
20 telephone dialing system and an artificial or prerecorded voice without Plaintiff's
21 prior express consent, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of the Class.
22 Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class
23 in that Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to any member of the Class.

24 31. Plaintiff and the members of the Class have all suffered irreparable
25 harm as a result of the Defendant's unlawful and wrongful conduct. Absent a
26 class action, the Class will continue to face the potential for irreparable harm. In
27 addition, these violations of law will be allowed to proceed without remedy and
28 Defendant will likely continue such illegal conduct. Because of the size of the

1 individual Class member's claims, few, if any, Class members could afford to
2 seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein.

3 32. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in handling class action
4 claims and claims involving violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection
5 Act.

6 33. A class action is a superior method for the fair and efficient
7 adjudication of this controversy. Class-wide damages are essential to induce
8 Defendant to comply with federal law. The interest of Class members in
9 individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against Defendant is
10 small because the maximum statutory damages in an individual action for
11 violation of privacy are minimal. Management of these claims is likely to present
12 significantly fewer difficulties than those presented in many class claims.

13 34. Defendant has acted on grounds generally applicable to the Class,
14 thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief and corresponding declaratory
15 relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

16
17 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**
18 **NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER**
19 **PROTECTION ACT**
20 **47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.**

21 35. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this
22 Complaint as though fully stated herein.

23 36. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous
24 and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each
25 and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.

26 37. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et
27 seq, Plaintiff and The Class are entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory
28 damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

1 38. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief
2 prohibiting such conduct in the future.

3
4 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**
5 **KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE**
6 **TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT**
7 **47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.**

8 39. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this
9 Complaint as though fully stated herein.

10 40. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendant constitute numerous
11 and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not
12 limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et
13 seq.

14 41. As a result of Defendant's knowing and/or willful violations of 47
15 U.S.C. § 227 et seq, Plaintiff and The Class are entitled to an award of \$1,500.00
16 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §
17 227(b)(3)(C).

18 42. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief
19 prohibiting such conduct in the future.

20 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

21 Wherefore, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court grant Plaintiff and The
22 Class members the following relief against Defendant:

23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE**
24 **TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.**

25 43. As a result of Defendant's negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. §
26 227(b)(1), Plaintiff seeks for herself and each Class member \$500.00 in statutory
27 damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

28 44. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting
such conduct in the future.

